

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Con. Res. 394. Concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the South Carolina State Student Legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 457. Resolution opposing the Federal Communications Commission's position regarding high frequency and ultrahigh frequency television stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 458. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives for the purpose of investigating and studying facts and circumstances leading to the selection and approval of a segment of highway route to be incorporated in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 459. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Commerce take no further action on certain segments of a route to be incorporated in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9230. A bill for the relief of Samir Zoghby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9231. A bill for the relief of Armando Tena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 9232. A bill for the relief of Shaker Youssif Yacoub (also known as Chaker Youssif Jacob); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9233. A bill for the relief of William J. Heffern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9234. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Y. S. Tien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9235. A bill for the relief of Luciano Lo Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9236. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leopoldo C. Jose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9237. A bill for the relief of Michele Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9238. A bill for the relief of Donald Heywood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9239. A bill for the relief of Istvan Papp, also known as Stefan Papp, and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 9240. A bill for the relief of Vincenza Giammona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9241. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Melmeti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 9242. A bill for the relief of Joseph Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### The Family Fallout Shelter

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully call the attention of the Members to what I hope will set a precedent for the towns and villages across our land. Through the urging of August Stout, town supervisor, the town of Brookhaven, Long Island, N.Y., has provided a typical family fallout shelter on the grounds of the Town Hall, built for general demonstration from specifications drawn up by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and fully equipped as recommended by that agency.

At 2 o'clock next Monday, September 18, one of our local townsmen will start demonstrating its livability to the public at large through radio broadcasts during his week's tenancy, in which he will describe his reactions while living there, closed off from the rest of the world and dependent entirely on the food and equipment he finds therein.

Since the beginning of September we have been appalled by the insane irresponsibility of the Soviet Union in setting off one atomic blast after another, spewing radioactive debris into the atmosphere with complete disregard for the future of the human race. Today's newspapers carry the latest poll on what the American people feel their chances of survival in all-out nuclear attack are, demonstrating their grim realization of the extreme dangers involved, and of their limited hopes for survival.

Walter Lippmann writes in his column:

Though nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely, it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however irrational it may

be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. \* \* \*. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable \* \* \*. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation, and therefore of war.

My mail is beginning to reflect the growing concern of the American people. One constituent tells me he is going ahead with his own fallout shelter. "This," he tells me, "I believe is the true American way. The Government is there to support, but not to substitute, for individual initiative."

We all share the nightmare feeling that we are hurtling toward total oblivion at an ever faster pace. Let us hope it is only a nightmare from which we will awaken. But meanwhile let us give our families every protection we can; let each community show its inhabitants how to construct a fallout shelter, as the town of Brookhaven is doing.

### Surplus Properties for YMCA's and YWCA's

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies.

My bill would broaden the eligibility of recipients of surplus property under the law to allow certain tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare and recreation agencies to take advantage of surplus prop-

erties being disposed of by the Government. Under the present law, these properties may be donated only to schools, colleges, civil defense organizations, medical institutions, health centers, and related institutions.

These agencies, which would be added to the eligibility list to receive donable surplus property, contribute significantly to our society and our way of life. These agencies, the YMCA's and YWCA's, religious groups of all denominations, boys clubs, and the like are a valuable asset to our Nation. They deal with the bodies and souls of our citizens and make contributions to their betterment.

The donation of surplus properties to these agencies will enable them to expand their programs. Every little help to these agencies is valuable to them, and the people they serve.

The spirit of charity, which prevails in America, has spurred outstanding activity in the field of privately supported welfare and recreation agencies. This bill seeks to enable these agencies to take advantage of surplus material to expand their program. I urge prompt and favorable committee action on this measure.

### Results of a Questionnaire

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed a questionnaire to registered-voter households in the 30th Congressional District of California. Over 100,000 questionnaires were sent out, and I am pleased to report that nearly 20,000 completed questionnaires were returned.

In my opinion, the folks back home in my congressional district, or any other congressional district in the country, are way ahead of Washington in their thoughts on the important issues facing

the Nation. The results of this questionnaire confirm this premise.

A close analysis of the response to the 16 questions submitted to my constituency reveals clear and precise opinions

on matters vital to the future of the United States.

I am very proud to submit herewith the tabulated results of my annual legislative questionnaire:

#### Questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should Red China be admitted to the U.N.?	10	87	3
2. Should Red China be recognized diplomatically by the United States?	16	80	4
3. Are you willing to pay 5 cents instead of 4 cents to mail a letter to help end the postal deficit?	69	27	4
4. Do you favor Federal Aid to Education for—			
(a) School construction?	40	44	16
(b) Teachers' salaries?	23	59	18
(c) Areas only which are "impacted" by defense activities?	42	35	23
(d) None at all?	11	34	55
5. Should the farm price-support program be scrapped entirely?	66	27	7
6. Should the Geneva nuclear test ban talks be ended?	61	34	5
7. Should the social security law be amended to include medical care for the aged?	49	48	3
8. Should there be a withholding tax and interest on savings accounts and on corporate dividends?	18	78	4
9. Should the United States resume testing nuclear weapons underground?	86	9	5
10. When you first heard President Kennedy was going to Vienna to talk with Khrushchev, did you think it a good idea?	38	59	3
11. Now that the Vienna talks have occurred, do you think the outcome was—			
(a) More favorable to the United States than the U.S.S.R.?	8	30	62
(b) More favorable to the U.S.S.R. than the United States?	23	15	62
(c) About even?	24	13	63
(d) Nothing accomplished?	42	26	32
12. In general, do you feel there are enough laws restraining business?	82	14	4
13. In general, do you feel there are enough laws restraining labor unions?	11	87	2
14. How would you vote on the following recommendations President Kennedy made to Congress in his May 25 speech?			
(a) Send a man to the moon and back by 1970 and spend an additional \$7,000,000,000 to \$9,000,000,000 during the next 5 years toward doing it.	44	51	5
(b) Boost foreign aid program by \$535,000,000, to bring total foreign aid spending to \$2,650,000,000 for the next year.	21	74	5
(c) Triple spending on civil defense (fallout shelters, warning measures, food stockpiles, etc.) to about \$312,000,000.	56	38	6
(d) Spend \$121,000,000 next year for the U.S. Information Agency to disseminate information overseas.	57	35	8
(e) Increase Army and Marine Corps strength to meet brush-fire situations; increase nonnuclear firepower and guerrilla training.	89	7	4
(f) Establish a strengthened and enlarged U.S. Disarmament Administration.	20	68	12
(g) Give the President a \$250,000,000 contingency fund for flexible response to new, but as yet unknown, crises and opportunities occurring overseas during the next year.	39	56	5
15. Is the United States in a nonmilitary war with communism which could end in total victory for either side without ever firing a shot? (If you answered "yes," please answer the following:)	85	9	6
(a) Do Americans generally realize we are fighting it now?	22	68	10
(b) Is our Government organized to fight it effectively?	8	78	14
(c) Are we putting enough skill and effort into it?	4	84	12
(d) Are we winning?	4	79	17
(e) Does winning possibly involve higher taxes and foregoing for a while some desirable domestic programs?	70	17	13
16. Do you favor sending armed forces to Cuba to get rid of Castro without waiting any longer?	64	30	6

#### Pattern for a Red Africa

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Is the present U.N. armed intervention in Katanga setting a pattern for a Red Africa? That is a question very many Americans are asking these days as they contemplate the news reports of carnage, violence and political chicanery in the Congo.

On what logical basis do armed, aggressive U.N. forces intervene in behalf of possible pro-Soviet, pro-Communist, anti-American and anti-free world leadership in Katanga to replace a leadership which, whatever its merits or demerits, is lined up solidly on the side of free enterprise, democratic principles, anticommunism and warm friendship toward the West.

The money of this Nation and the American people is being used to finance reportedly about one-half of the total cost of the current U.N. military operations in Katanga. Thus, American money is being used to oust our friends and install our potential enemies in positions of leadership in Katanga.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that there should be deep concern in this country about this ag-

gressive, violent program, the most likely net result of which, may well be to put radical, pro-Communist, anti-American leaders in control of the rich, productive state of Katanga. Is there no other way, a way short of putting pro-Communists in power, by which the U.N. can establish order and peace in the Congo.

How soon will this pattern spread or be applied to other African States? Is it not very likely that this policy will ultimately turn all Africa Red? Do we remember China and the harmless agrarian reformers?

I think it is high time our State Department and our U.N. delegation reappraised the entire African situation in the light of these ominous developments in the Congo. Speed and prompt, effective action is imperative to offset the Red anschluss in Africa.

#### Plea for a Green Legacy

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ALEXANDER WILEY**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation needs to undertake more realistic, creative and far-reaching programs for the best utilization, preservation and, if possible, replenishment of our out-of-

door heritage—if it is to meet the needs of the future.

How can this more effectively be done? Recently, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall published an article in the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Plea for a Green Legacy."

In my judgment, the Secretary makes some astute observations and recommendations that deserve not only the thoughtful consideration of Congress but of the American people. As pointed out by the Secretary:

The challenge to conservation statesmanship in our time is the achievement of balance between the works of man and the handiwork of nature. However, the sad truth is that development tends to outrun planning in our society. If we are to maintain man's proper relationship to the land, it is plain that we must broaden the role of resource planning in the management of our national estate.

Reflecting further upon the way in which conservation is a responsibility not only of Congress but of the people, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 11, 1961]

#### PLEA FOR A GREEN LEGACY

(By Stewart L. Udall, U.S. Secretary of the Interior)

WASHINGTON.—With all the weight of his world leadership responsibilities upon him, the contemporary American is rushing at a



headlong pace to expand his scientific technology and to develop his land and its resources.

Our capacity to alter the world of nature is truly awesome. Population pressures and the requirements of commercial expansion and urban growth are constantly at work enlarging the manmade portion of our environment and diminishing the natural.

Indeed, the challenge to conservation statesmanship in our time is the achievement of balance between the works of men and the handiwork of nature.

Admittedly, we must move ahead with the development of our land resources. Likewise, our technology must be refined. But in the long run life will succeed only in a life-giving environment, and we can no longer afford unnecessary sacrifices of living space and natural landscapes to "progress."

The sad truth is that development tends to outrun planning in our society. More often than not, the bulldozer's work is done before the preservationist and the planner arrive on the scene.

#### BROADER PLANNING URGED

If we are to maintain man's proper relationship to the land, it is plain that we must insist that our developers be more conservation minded, and we must broaden the role of resource planning in the management of our national estate.

The American continent has, from the very first, been hospitable to humankind. Its glory has always been its spaciousness and solitude. But the good earth will remain good only if we make it so. In our haste to build new factories and roads and suburbs we must take care that man's need to refresh himself in his natural environment is not foreclosed.

President Kennedy has called for one last great effort in the 1960's to finish the conservation work begun by Theodore Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt counseled Americans to "set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole rich, forested lands and the flower-clad meadows of our mountains."

"To skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them," Mr. Roosevelt warned.

#### CAPE COD TO INDIANA DUNES

This same spirit motivated the first major conservation accomplishment of President Kennedy's administration—the creation of a magnificent National Seashore Park on the ocean sands of Cape Cod.

A few days ago I climbed to the highest of the Indiana dunes along Lake Michigan to view a race between industrial development and conservation. In 1916 Stephen Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, hiked to the same promontory and urged that a great national park embracing 26 miles of dune shoreline be created for the populous Midwest heartland—the only area of the United States which has no major unit in the National Park System.

But Mather gathered too little support, and now one of his friends pointed to the remaining isolated tracts of this unique shoreline and said to me:

"You are 40 years too late."

At every hand near our growing centers of population similar opportunities are slipping through our fingers. Once land development has begun it is invariably too late, for land prices quickly soar beyond the public purse.

#### AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM SOUGHT

What strategy, what plan of action, will save enough space for all of our people? Leadership from our public men is, of course, indispensable. Federal action is needed to round out our national park and wildlife

refuge systems and to develop fully the recreation potential of our forestlands.

We must also have aggressive State park expansion programs—such as those in New York, California, and Pennsylvania—to reserve new parklands before they are pre-empted. Municipal leadership, too, is essential if we are to provide adequate city park systems and enough fringe open space to permit our cities to expand gracefully.

We also need—and here the burden falls heaviest on local leadership—creative and farsighted use of zoning regulations and land-use plans to compel the speculator and developer to put people first and insure that adequate space is allotted to playgrounds and parks.

Government can provide the main thrust, but individuals must play a creative role if we are to insure an adequate heritage for all Americans.

#### PHILANTHROPISTS NEEDED

Above all, the cause of conservation needs a new generation of outdoor philanthropists. Philanthropy comes to our vocabulary from the Greek, and describes an attitude of loving mankind.

On looking back over the history of conservation it is surprising how much of our total accomplishment is attributable to quiet men from private life who at crucial moments have provided the needed inspiration and wherewithal.

The towering redwood tree of the conservation forest has been, of course, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. His natural and historic philanthropies span our continent. Every American who loves the out of doors owes this man a debt.

His saving work has benefited such far-flung and poetic places as Acadia National Park in Maine, Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado, Hudson Pallsades in New Jersey, and Williamsburg, colonial capital in Virginia. Mr. Rockefeller also used his generosity to evoke generosity in others.

When decisions hung in the balance, he inspired the States of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia to put up the matching gifts that led to the establishment of Great Smoky Mountains and Shenandoah National Parks. Now his son, Laurance, is carrying on his tradition, and it was he who gave to the people of the United States our newest national park in the Virgin Islands.

#### POETRY OF THE LAND

"The United States themselves are essentially the greatest poems," Walt Whitman once wrote. And those conservation philanthropists who have caught Whitman's vision have acted so that the poetry of our land might be sung by nature for all men of all ages.

Today foundations and individuals are sponsoring a variety of conservation projects. The Avalon and Old Dominion Foundations of the Mellon family have financed studies of our vanishing shorelines—and have underwritten much of the initial cost of our first national seashore at Cape Hatteras.

In Virginia the Old Dominion Foundation, under the inspired leadership of Paul Mellon, is surveying and purchasing secluded wilderness spots of riverbank, marsh, and forest. These are being saved both as scientific laboratories of life in its natural balance, as well as, in the words of Old Dominion's Monroe Bush, "for the people who will live 25 years from now."

Philanthropy has many pathways. How many Americans know of Mrs. Louis Bruguere's gift of the Vanderbilt Mansion; the National Geographic Society's gift of Russell Cave to the national park system; the largess of former Maine Governor, Percival P. Baxter, who acquired Mount Katahdin and nearly 200,000 surrounding acres of magnificent mountain wilderness and endowed

his native State with one of the largest and finest State parks in the Union?

#### MANY WAYS TO HELP

Who recalls the Princeton professor and his wife who donated the lovely Herontown Woods as a nature sanctuary, or the man in Lincoln, Mass., who volunteered to have his woods and fields zoned to remain always in their native state?

All these people acted from a shared conviction that the private citizen must play a vital role in preserving an environment that renews and sustains human life.

Every city, every State, every region should have its foundation, its citizens' band with the motives and zeal of the Save-the-Redwoods-League (California) or the Sudbury Valley Trustees (Massachusetts) working to preserve threatened native grounds. Enlightened pioneers in land conservation have already fashioned the tools. The opportunities for their use are present at every hand.

Let us never have to say, in sorrow, as did Plato: "There are mountains in Attica which can now keep nothing but bees, but which were clothed, not so very long ago, with trees."

The individual who wishes to contribute to conservation has numerous options. He may donate land or money to State or Federal park agencies such as the national park trust fund. He can give his land, his money, or his time to a private organization such as the Nature Conservancy.

#### ORGANIZATION'S WORK DESCRIBED

Mettler's Woods, in New Jersey; the entire watershed of Elder Creek in northern California; Mainus Gorge in Westchester County; Battle Creek Cypress Swamp near the Delaware Water Gap, and Holly Ridge in Missouri are only a few of the unique natural areas preserved through gifts made to the Nature Conservancy.

On the other hand those who wish to use their land for life, can, by will or testament, add to the public estate and to the enjoyment of all. Close to Metropolitan Washington, in the fields of rural Maryland, rises Sugarloaf Mountain, a landmark for miles around. The entire mountain was once owned by the Strong family, who left this lovely estate and its gardens, as well as the forested mountain, for perpetual public use.

The individual who wishes to make a lesser, but no less significant, gift can voluntarily zone his property and dedicate a scenic easement that will maintain in perpetuity the present character of his lands. In Monterey County, Calif., over 4,000 acres have been pledged to such scenic easements—including some of the incomparable coastline of the Big Sur.

Conservation may also serve a dual purpose. In seeking to honor their heroes men often have turned to monuments of stone or bronze.

#### EXAMPLE OF A MEMORIAL

Shortly after the passing of Theodore Roosevelt, his friends saved a lovely Potomac River island which was marked for conversion into a utility storage depot and gave it to the country as a nature memorial to a man who had a lifetime love affair with the out of doors.

Many of us in Washington regard this "wild little island" in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial as perhaps the most fitting of our monuments—and the one that would accord the greatest pleasure to the man it honors.

The conservation philanthropy needed today must come from all of us who during our lives have made withdrawals from nature's bank and want to restore the balance with a corresponding conservation deposit. This work of restoration and renewal is worthy of our highest efforts, and even those who lack wherewithal can become the or-

ganizers and supporters of groups that will give new dimensions to our conservation effort.

Few of us can hope to leave a work of art, or a poem, to posterity; but together—if we act before it is too late—we can set aside a few more great parks, and round out our system of refuges for wildlife. Or, working at other levels, we can reserve a marsh or meadow, or an avenue of open space as a green legacy for other generations.

By a series of such acts of conservation we can do much to save what Thomas Jefferson called the face and character of our country.

If we do this, surely those who follow, whether or not our names survive, will remember and praise our vision and our works.

## The 30th Armored Division Commended at Smithville, Tenn., Armory Dedication

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the remarks which I was privileged to make at the dedication of the new National Guard Armory ceremonies, in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

#### THE 30TH ARMORED DIVISION COMMENDED AT SMITHVILLE, TENN., ARMORY DEDICATION

Thank you General Giles, General Nunnally, Mayor Smith, Judge Foutch, Major Dyer, Captain Wilson, members of the Tennessee National Guard, ladies and gentlemen, my homefolks, and friends, certainly, I am pleased and delighted to be privileged to attend this ceremony and to participate in the dedication of this splendid new armory—the National Guard Armory—of which all are justly proud.

When Major Dyer, Captain Wilson, Sergeant Vickers and others invited me some weeks ago to participate in these dedication ceremonies I anticipated that the Congress would be in adjournment by Labor Day. I thus accepted as I wanted to be in attendance at this significant occasion. This is indeed a great day and an occasion that many of you—all of us—have looked forward to for a long time.

Today we are not only celebrating an accomplishment, but we are celebrating a victory for the Army National Guard of Tennessee and this means that we are celebrating a victory for everyone in the land.

The action which finally cleared the way for the construction of this armory has been a part of a nationwide struggle, over a period of several years, to prevent the crippling of the National Guard Establishment.

There have been those who have felt that our National Guard units could be cut down and reduced—and that the building of additional armory facilities was not needed, essential or necessary.

We have thus experienced a period of retrenchment—a time when an effort has been made to cut back—to cut down and reduce the home guard.

Our local MP battalion certainly has been in the very midst of this proposed retrenchment. There was a time when some felt that we would lose our local unit by consolidation with another organization.

We have thus won a victory not only for this new armory—but also for the 130th MP Battalion.

It is significant that we are thus dedicating this armory at a time when the effort

to reduce the size of the National Guard has been checked and reversed, and at a time when active duty alerts and orders are going to many National Guard units—as our Nation girds itself for an eventuality in the world crisis which has been precipitated by the threat of Communist expansion.

This armory was planned several years ago by those with vision—men who believe in strength and preparedness and in keeping our country strong.

This armory represents the work of many citizens cooperating and working together to bring this armory to Smithville and our county. Certainly, Maj. Bill Dyer, editor of the Smithville Review, and Sgt. Jimmy D. Vickers, unit leader, led the charge that gained for us this armory.

Major Dyer and all the men of his command contacted members of the county court and secured their assurance of cooperation.

They preserved and obtained approval of a matching fund grant from the adjutant general of Tennessee. This called for a similar grant from the National Guard Bureau and cooperation on the Federal level to assure final approval, authorization and appropriations.

Congress appropriated at this time \$45 million for an armory construction program throughout the Nation. Of this amount, only \$15 million was released by the Bureau of the Budget for a limited construction program—the \$30 million remainder was impounded and withheld.

At this time only two National Guard armories were approved for construction in Tennessee—one at Nashville and this one at Smithville.

The combined efforts and cooperation of all citizens at all levels of government were successful in securing the construction of this splendid and modern facility.

Our city, county, State and Federal officials certainly have performed frontline duty in this cooperative action.

I know that General Nunnally, our State's fine adjutant general, will approve of my giving a full measure of credit to his predecessor, former Adj. Gen. Joe W. Henry, Jr., who gave notable assistance in furthering this armory project at a time when we were trying also to keep and maintain a guard unit here in Smithville.

In a personal way, I want to say that whatever I may have been able to do in helping to push this project to completion has been indeed a "labor of love."

I am proud and happy to salute, commend and to congratulate the men of the 130th MP Battalion—our local home guard unit—and all the officers and men of the famed 30th Armored Division. I wish every man of this command "Godspeed" in the future as you drill and train and prepare for any and every eventuality on the home-front or wherever you may be called—as you continue your patriotic service to our country.

This armory and the guard unit that maintains its headquarters here are a part—a very significant and important part—of our national strength. We regard this armory and the 130th MP Battalion as a bastion of strength here in our midst in De Kalb County.

This unit is composed of volunteers who exemplify the finest spirit and tradition and patriotism of the Volunteer State of Tennessee.

The officers and men of the 130th MP Battalion are men of the highest sense of duty and patriotism. They are our neighbors and friends and we are proud of them—every man—every member of this unit.

They have won this armory and established for themselves a place in our community as they have won a place in the hearts and affections of all our citizens.

This achievement of this armory in a very real way illustrates what we have been do-

ing in the present session of the Congress. The Congress has completed 8 months of continuous session—now into the ninth month. The Congress has been considering and working on one of the biggest and most extensive legislative programs in more than a decade. In the main, three major buildups are now underway:

1. Buildup of our national strength—national defense; \$46.5 billion has been appropriated for this purpose. This means a bigger Army, a stronger Navy and the most modern and powerful Air Force in any nation's history. It means a bigger Marine Corps and new and modern weapons. It means greater military strength for our country.

2. Buildup of our economic strength—the building of interstate highways, the building of hospitals, great housing programs, great programs of conservation, the building of dams, and defense installations. All these projects are capital investments in America and they strengthen our economy.

3. Buildup of our friends—allies around the world.

We know and recognize now that the Marshall plan in 1948 strengthened Western Europe against communism—and we know today that some form of foreign aid or mutual assistance is necessary. It is a part of our national defense—and defense strategy.

Some aspects of the program have been badly managed and costly, but all recognize that some form of proper assistance to strengthen and help our allies and ourselves is necessary and essential at this time to help stem the tide and halt Communist expansion and aggression.

These are the three big buildups underway.

Certainly our National Guard is a very important part of our defense posture for strength.

The greatest insurance for peace is to remain militarily strong.

We are proud of this great division—the 30th Armored Division. Again, I salute you and congratulate you—all the men of this command. I know that I express the high sentiments of all when I say that we are proud of every man of this command—all volunteer patriots of Tennessee.

As we dedicate this splendid new armory, let us dedicate it as a symbol of strength—strength at home, strength for our State and strength for the Nation.

It is also appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to a spirit of unity of national purpose and cooperation as we join hands and march forward—each contributing his part to defending, preserving, promoting and perpetuating our freedom and liberty and our cherished American way of life.

## A Significant Factor in American Education

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this month a record number of American children were enrolled in schools throughout the Nation—a majority in public schools but a significant number in parochial institutions.

This month also saw devastating setbacks to the cause of world peace in the Soviet Union's irresponsible resumption



of nuclear tests, in the tension-ridden crisis in Berlin, in the perilous state of the United Nations.

If ever it was important to recognize the strength of our resources, it is now. And our most important resource is our youth, now being prepared to meet the most difficult challenge that has yet faced mankind.

A nation is no stronger than the care it devotes to the training of its youth—to the assurance that the traditions and knowledge of a great and complex society are passed on to future generations.

The question of Federal aid to education is a perplexing constitutional issue. The educational crisis has pressed this issue to the forefront. I am confident that the problem will be solved in the American way—with due respect for the rights of all concerned. I hope and pray that bigotry is restrained, that a solution will be based on reason and right, not emotion and prejudice.

No matter how divisive the question of Federal aid may be, it has served a useful purpose. An issue such as this serves to bring into focus the various facets of our American educational system. In the deliberations on the subject, the role of public education has been prominently discussed and properly evaluated. It is important, too, to bring the role of our parochial system into proper perspective.

It is the role of Catholic education and its significant contribution to the development of better citizens and a stronger America that I want to discuss today.

There are 6 million students now being educated in private schools, 5.27 million of whom are being trained in Catholic-affiliated educational institutions. In the New York City area alone, there are 482 Catholic-affiliated primary and secondary schools, enrolling 360,033 students. In New York City, 1 out of every 3 school-age children—between the ages of 6 and 18—is being educated in a Catholic-affiliated school.

In properly evaluating the role of education—both public and parochial—it is important to remember that good citizens are made, not born. Through much of the last century and well into this one, American education—public, Catholic and other nonpublic—faced and met the monumental challenge of helping the children of millions of immigrants along the road to good citizenship.

Today, when there is so much ignorance of and hostility to the American ideal of democracy, citizenship training is perhaps a more vital educational obligation than ever before. America's Catholic educators are fully alert to this responsibility.

The Catholic philosophy of education insists on the moral goodness of the individual citizen as a prior condition to the maintenance of a free society. The pupils attending Catholic schools are kept continually aware of duties toward their country and all fellow citizens. One of the most important of these civic obligations is the tolerance which encourages national harmony and unity in our pluralistic society.

The flag is found in every classroom of a Catholic school. Each schoolday be-

gins with the pledge of allegiance. National and State holidays are celebrated; essays and speeches are composed by pupils for patriotic events and competitions; outstanding American statesmen and heroes are revered.

American history receives due weight in the curriculum. Social studies make the pupils more community conscious. Respect for human life and dignity, for civil and property rights, is emphasized in ethics courses. Sociologists have noted the interest Catholic students have in social problems affecting international life, labor-management relations, and racial tensions.

Catholic educators strive to work closely with public-school officials in training students in community responsibility. During American Education Week, Catholic schools encourage visits by public-school pupils, and members of more than 4,000 Catholic civics clubs of America are urged to take an interest in public-school activities. Many Catholic-school administrators belong to State, regional, and national educational organizations, where they meet and exchange ideas with colleagues from public institutions. Catholic-school participation in such activities as the safety patrol, Boy and Girl Scouts, Junior Red Cross, and 4-H clubs is widespread.

An important contribution made by Catholic schools to national education is the diversity they help to provide in education, thus safeguarding the basic freedom of parents to educate their children in schools of their own choosing. Also, as Will Herberg and other qualified non-Catholic observers have noted, the fact that the United States has not one but many school systems has preserved a healthy element of competition.

Educators are fond of the term "outcomes" to describe the final career placement of their graduates. In a sense, the "outcomes" of many American graduates, as far as citizenship is concerned, is finally determined during time of national crisis. A quarter of the Armed Forces in World War II were Catholic. Shortly before his death in the Pacific, Navy Comdr. John J. Shea, of Boston, wrote his 5-year-old son, Jackie: "Be a good Catholic, and you can't help being a good American."

### The South Carolina Student Legislature

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, by an act of our State legislature in 1957, the South Carolina State Student Legislature came into being. This legislature is composed entirely of students from the various college campuses in our State. This student legislative body functions exactly the same as any other legislature. Each campus elects congressmen and senators to represent it at annual sessions in our State capital, Columbia. Also elected

are a governor, a lieutenant governor, a secretary of state, and an attorney general. Committees are formed, and other officials are appointed by the governor including a treasurer, a press secretary, and so forth. The procedure observed in conducting business is the same as that of our regular legislative process.

The governor is the official spokesman for the student legislature. The present governor, Mr. William L. Schachte, Jr., is a student at Clemson College in my congressional district. Mr. Schachte is doing an outstanding job in bringing to the attention of South Carolinians and citizens of the Nation as a whole the importance of their program. His able lieutenant governor, F. Glenn Smith, of Charleston, has also contributed much to the success of this body.

Mr. Speaker, the honor and pleasure of addressing this worthwhile organization was afforded me last year. Thus I can say, firsthand, that the South Carolina State Student Legislature is the finest of its kind and the most beneficial student organization I have seen—from the standpoints both of the students directly involved and the other citizens of our State. Not only does this organization constitute a practical educational experience for these young people, but it also serves in an advisory capacity to our own South Carolina State Legislature in that almost all bills passed by this student body have been enacted verbatim by the State legislature. These students seriously and conscientiously accept responsibility and respond with unbelievable results. They are aware that the world is not going to wait on them, that both foreign and domestic problems are more complex than ever before, and that they must be prepared and willing to meet the challenge now.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly recommend that all States join South Carolina in adopting a similar student legislature. We are extremely proud of our young people and the fact that they have proved they can accept responsibility. Therefore, I join my distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] in introducing the following concurrent resolution today:

Whereas the South Carolina State Student Legislature was created by State statute in 1957; and

Whereas all colleges and universities in the State of South Carolina are afforded an opportunity to participate in the South Carolina State Student Legislature and most do so participate; and

Whereas the purpose of the South Carolina State Student Legislature is to provide an opportunity to learn the fundamentals of government by duplicating all functions of the State government; and

Whereas the State Legislature of South Carolina has been impressed by the legislative actions of the South Carolina State Student Legislature since its inception: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extends its congratulations to the South Carolina State Student Legislature and expresses its belief that this type of organization provides an excellent method for combining theoretical knowledge and practical experience in teaching the fundamentals of democratic government, and is one which could well be adopted by all States.

## Peterson Adamantly Opposed to the Admission of Red China Into the U.N.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, to clarify my opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an exchange of letters to the editor of the Ogden Standard Examiner between Mr. A. L. Petersen of 1485 Marilyn Drive, Ogden, Utah, and me, on this very important question. Mr. Petersen's original letter to the editor was based upon an article in the Ogden Standard-Examiner wherein I stated that Red China would probably gain admission to the United Nations and that a program should be launched immediately to condition the U.S. mind to this possibility.

It was my privilege to again join my colleagues in the House on August 31 in overwhelmingly voting against diplomatic recognition by the U.S. Government of the regime of Communist China and against its admission to the United Nations. This is the second time Congress has been called upon for an expression of sentiment since I have been a Member of Congress, and the second time I have voted against the admission of Red China into the U.N.

The letters in question, as printed by the Ogden Standard-Examiner, follow: [From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, July 14, 1961]

### ATTITUDE OF DEFEATISM

DEAR SIR: I read the interview of Representative M. Blaine Peterson, Democrat of Utah, in Monday evening's Standard-Examiner with more than a little displeasure. Since when do the minds of the U.S. people have to be conditioned to defeat—somehow this just doesn't seem right. It sounds as if we have "quitters" representing us in high places.

If the nations of the world are now viewing the admission of Red China more favorably, it would seem to throw more weight on a rather basic fact, that one does not buy true allegiance nor friendship. I wonder if our foreign aid hasn't been too heavy in goods and too light in information. Perhaps, instead of launching a program to condition the minds of the U.S. citizenry, our so-called "leaders" ought to launch a program to educate the minds of those who are succumbing to Communist propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. PETERSEN.

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, Aug. 7, 1961]

### MISUNDERSTANDING

EDITOR: Obviously a clear understanding of my reasons for opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations is necessary as a result of the letter to the editor of Mr. A. L. Petersen, of 1485 Marilyn Drive, Ogden, based on your report of an interview when I was in Utah recently. I am glad to see Mr. Petersen's concern. Similar interest has also been expressed in letters directly to me.

I went on record as opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations

shortly after I came to Congress when I signed the petition and became one of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I would be proud to vote my conviction if I were a member of the United Nations, but, as you know, the only vote the United States will have on this important question will be cast by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

In June of this year, Ambassador Stevenson discussed the China situation with us and, at that time, it was his judgment that we do not have the votes in the U.N. to prevent the seating of Red China in the General Assembly when they meet this fall. This was most certainly not an attitude of defeatism as such, but was an indication and expression of the Ambassador's deep concern based on a careful and continued study of this matter, plus his experience in foreign affairs over a period of many years.

Distasteful as the facts may be to those of us who are opposed to the seating of Red China, let us look at the record.

Last fall only 42 of the U.N.'s members voted for the moratorium to postpone the subject of the admission of Red China. Thirty-four nations were favorable toward consideration of the subject. Twenty-two nations abstained, but of these 22 it is important to note that they were mostly from the newly independent African states. They were frank to state that their newness to the U.N. controlled their decision, but that they expected to vote to consider the China question this year. Proof of their intention is positive in that many of them have since declared themselves in favor of China's admission, the most recent example is to be found in the declaration for China's seating of Pakistan's President who just concluded a visit to this country.

A recent publication on U.N. affairs entitled "War/Piece Report" is reputed to have polled 96 of the 99 members on the China question. More than three-fourths, the report states, said Communist China should have a seat in both the General Assembly and in the Security Council. Unquestionably, this spells double-trouble for the United States.

The European countries are looking to the United States to make the first move. Should we act to extend the present moratorium, we can expect sure defeat and an immediate vote on whether Communist or Nationalist China has the proper credentials to sit. This could very possibly result in a twin China recognition. In other words, a dual China situation could possibly mean admission of Red China in the General Assembly and leave Nationalist China in the Security Council. Perhaps Red China and Russia are dealing these cards intentionally.

Marquis Childs, a journalist of national renown, recently made this a subject of his article in connection with the future responsibilities of Chester Bowles and, among other things, said this:

"The obscure outlines of another decision, still shrouded in top secrecy, is currently involved. That is whether to try to make any change in China policy in view of the fact that the United Nations General Assembly will almost certainly vote Red China into the U.N. in the fall.

"Should a 'two Chinas' policy be advanced by the United States? Should Outer Mongolia be recognized as a practical way of asserting independence of Chiang Kai-shek's veto over American policy? Should the American public be educated to the need for a change lest when the U.N. vote comes with a shock of surprise, it will lead to a perhaps irresistible demand to take this country out of the world organization?"

The reaction of Mr. Petersen to your report on our interview is healthy, and I hope more people will consider the seriousness of the

decisions that are facing President Kennedy as our Commander in Chief and of the State Department.

I have long subscribed to the adage, "to be forewarned is to be forearmed," and I hope that this rather detailed explanation will foster additional concern and interest because we have a problem in the Red China situation that demands the combined intelligence, faith and prayer of every loyal American who shares my determination that the United Nations must not become Communist dominated.

Sincerely yours,

M. BLAINE PETERSON,  
Member of Congress.

## Murfreesboro, Tenn., Dedicates New Post Office Building

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the speech which I was privileged to deliver at the dedication of the new post office building at Murfreesboro, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, in the RECORD.

The remarks at this dedication ceremony follow:

MURFREESBORO, TENN., DEDICATES NEW POST OFFICE BUILDING

(Address by Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee)

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Postmaster Byrn, Mayor Todd, my colleagues, Senators KEFAUVER and GORE, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and friends, it is a great pleasure to join with you in celebrating this occasion and to participate in this dedication ceremony.

Certainly, this is a banner day for Murfreesboro. I know it is a day you have looked forward to for a long time. It is a day that brings to realization a hope and a dream that the people of Murfreesboro and the surrounding communities have had for many years—the dedication of this splendid new post office building here in Murfreesboro.

On my visits here over the past years, and in communication with many of your citizens, I have been repeatedly made aware of the great need, interest and desire of the people for a new post office building to be built on a site close to the heart of your progressive community—for a facility which meets all of your present needs and is adequate to your present needs for many years of future development.

I commend and congratulate Postmaster Charlie Byrn, Mayor Todd, Judge Threet, and many others. In fact it seems most all of the citizens have made this project the No. 1 Federal project with the highest priority.

All are to be commended—all are to be congratulated.

The completion of this building is a fine example of your local enterprise and Federal Government participation and cooperation.

The fact that this building stands here at last is a tribute to your persistence. You have brought about this result by putting into practice a basic rule of achievement as it was once defined for me in memorable fashion by a great Tennessean, the late



Judge Cordell Hull, whose memory we all cherish.

One day during my first term in the Congress, I was feeling a little impatient in my efforts to overcome some of the redtape that seems inevitably to clog the wheels in the vast machinery of our great Government. It was at this time that I took occasion to call upon and visit with Judge Hull, who had just retired as Secretary of State.

Judge Hull was most kindly and friendly and helpful, and he gave me some good pointers and sound advice. He stated that there were many qualities needed to become an effective Representative, but among the qualities most important he particularly stressed as absolutely necessary were the qualities of patience and perseverance.

"Be patient," he said, "and keep plugging for results."

I know today that this was about the best advice I ever received, and this new post office building in Murfreesboro is one more impressive confirmation of the wisdom and truth of Judge Hull's maxim on stick-to-it-iveness. Certainly it has taken a lot of patience and a lot of perseverance on the part of everyone concerned to bring this dream to realization.

#### LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

This building was erected under the Post Office Department's new commercial leasing program, whereby the Federal Government leases the facility from the private firm which holds possession of the grounds on which it stands and which contracted for the construction work.

This building is one of many presently being constructed throughout the country—as we are now moving forward in a greatly expanded post office modernization and replacement program. This marks an important advance for Murfreesboro to be provided with more adequate space, modern working conditions and better facilities to take care of the worsening mail resulting from growth of business and industry, generally, and the growth of our population in particular.

The commercial leasing program is the outgrowth of an experiment which started about 8 years ago, when the 83d Congress adopted a new method of handling the building of public buildings, and especially post offices, through what was then known as the lease-purchase plan. It provided that the buildings would be erected with private capital and funds, and the Federal Government would lease needed public buildings and pay for them over the years through the rental payments.

Disappointingly, that program never got underway or off the ground. After some 4 years, only two post offices were built under the Lease-Purchase Act and meanwhile all over the country more and more post offices were becoming outmoded and inefficient because of lack of space and lack of facilities to handle the increasing load expeditiously.

In 1954, I was honored by an election by my colleagues to membership on the Committee on Appropriations, which, as you know, appropriates the funds for all activities of our Federal Government. After our committee had looked into the operations of the lease-purchase program, it became obvious to members of the Committee that this program was not working. Therefore, the committee moved to revert to our traditional system of building public buildings with appropriated funds. We had a pretty big fight about this in the committee and on the floor of the House, but in the end the House adopted our committee's recommended policy. The Senate went along and thus the Congress once again returned to our traditional policy of appropriating funds for the construction of public buildings where au-

thorized and needed—and also to permit buildings being constructed under lease-purchase—either plan to get the needed job done.

Congress moved to put new life in the post office modernization and building program, by authorizing certain projects and appropriating the funds for them, but the Bureau of the Budget tied up the funds and refused to release the money so construction could be started.

I know we have all heard about Washington bureaucracy, but I can assure you that you do not know what bureaucracy is unless you have had some experience with Budget Bureau bureaucracy as developed particularly by the last administration. A small group of people in that Bureau operate as a type of supergovernment, trying to run the country according to their own ideas and often regardless of the policies established by Congress.

We have certainly had our difficulties—and our delays with a divided Government—a Democratic Congress and a Republican executive branch of the Government. Now we have a new administration—unified policies and we are moving forward.

Our new commercial leasing program, as it has been developed by the new administration, combined with the affirmative direction and efficient management seems to be the effective answer to the problem. Successful implementation of this program requires the constant and careful supervision by the Congress. Regardless of how much we improve our methods and techniques, we will always have to keep plugging away to get action on specific projects, which is only natural in an immense country such as ours where so many urgent tasks press for consideration all at once. We are moving ahead, but it takes perseverance and patience such as Murfreesboro has shown in bringing into being this splendid new post office building.

#### POST OFFICE SYMBOL OF TIE BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There was a time many years ago when the postman was about the only Federal official or Federal employee that our local citizens knew or came in contact with. However, over the years, as we all know, there has been a great growth in Federal programs and Federal activities, and today the post office building stands even stronger and more boldly as the link between people in the local community and the Federal Government—as a symbol of the strength of our great Federal Government.

Here will be housed the activities of the Post Office Department, including city delivery service, rural mail service, airmail service and all of the varied services and programs of the Post Office Department.

In addition, this building will serve as a center of information on matters of national defense, civil service, selective service, our county agricultural programs, and information on all other Federal activities is channeled directly through the post office.

Experience has demonstrated that our citizens want these services. No, my friends, our citizens do not want these programs curtailed or discontinued. They want service continued and expanded.

#### SYMBOL OF FAITH IN GROWTH OF A GREATER MURFREESBORO

We do not build fine new buildings such as this facility unless they are needed and unless the future of the city promises to justify the cost. So in meeting to dedicate this building we are also recognizing the growth of Murfreesboro and affirming our confidence and faith in this expanding community's future.

The Post Office Department, by providing this modern building with its many efficient

facilities for handling the mail, evidences its confidence in the future of Murfreesboro. More than that, it has made a significant contribution to the further progress of this city—to Murfreesboro and Rutherford County.

This new postal facility will not only benefit the citizens of the community by providing better and more efficient postal service. The construction of this building has made the old post office building available for another public use.

As you know, I was pleased to work with the General Services Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with city and county officials to see that the old post office building as surplus Federal property was turned over jointly to the city and county to be used for the Linebaugh Public Library. Thus the old postal facility—although inadequate for present required postal service needs—will continue to provide an important service to the community. It adds to your community establishment a facility that currently is valued at around \$90,000—well suited for a public library.

We are happy that both of these public improvements and services could be accomplished.

#### CONCLUSION—DEDICATION

So this new post office building stands as a symbol of service to our people. As we dedicate this building to the service of a greater Murfreesboro let it stand as a symbol of the Federal Government and strength of our country—a Government which should be and is the servant of our citizens and not the master of our people.

As we dedicate this new post office to the service of the people of Murfreesboro and Rutherford County, it is well also that we rededicate ourselves to a spirit of unity of purpose and to the determination to cooperate and work together in forwarding the great principles and ideals of our country that we may each contribute to making ourselves more useful in preserving liberty, justice, and democracy, and our cherished American way of life.

### Imports and Our Economy—The Relationship Between Aid and Trade

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, from the 21st District, at the Mining Congress Conference, held at Seattle, Wash., on September 11, 1961, on the subject of imports and our economy:

#### IMPORTS AND OUR ECONOMY—THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AID AND TRADE

(By the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania)

Patience sometimes is said to be the legislator's greatest virtue. With patience and conviction we can sometimes accomplish a great deal by way of amendment.

Three months after I became a Member of Congress, I became convinced that major changes must be made in our thinking and

planning in both foreign aid and reciprocal trades.

This past month a small, but significant change, was made in foreign aid legislation by way of the amendment I've sponsored since my first awakening to the inseparable relationship between "aid and trade."

This amendment, although not in the absolute form I presented, still lays down the principle that Americans should not be taxed to put themselves out of business, out of jobs, and into industrial oblivion.

Simply put, the Dent amendment means that no American taxpayer's money can be spent to build production facilities, factories, mines or agricultural developments abroad if the country receiving the aid exports the products of these facilities back to the United States.

It was a bitter pill to swallow for the out-and-out internationalists, both in as well as out of government.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee under the able and conscientious leadership of my friend and neighbor from Fayette County, the Honorable TOM MORGAN, helped me save the amendment by having a senior member of the committee, the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, amend the original, allowing the foreign country to ship back 10 percent of the production before becoming disqualified for foreign aid. This saved at least 90 percent of the practical portion, and 100 percent of the principle involved.

The real fight was put on in the conference committee, when the State Department pulled out all stops to kill the Dent-Zablocki compromise. It was the bitterest fight of all the issues at stake in the House/Senate conference. In order to save the principle of the amendment, the House conferees had to accept an additional 10 percent by allowing the aid-receiving countries to ship 20 percent of their products back to the United States.

Without both MORGAN and ZABLOCKI being members of the conference, the amendment would have been killed by State Department officials, especially the Foreign Trade Department under Under Secretary George Ball. No one deserves more credit than the chairman, "Tom" MORGAN, for standing pat on the principle involved.

Conviction has taken us this far; patience will get us all the way. The day must come when we realize that unless we protect our home economy, we can't help the underdeveloped nations or anyone else, including ourselves.

The one point that seems to have been missed by many of our colleagues is the fact that the relationship between free aid and free trade is finally admitted by Congress and our Government.

The Washington Post was very critical of my amendment. It protested our attempt to save jobs for Americans by limiting the aid-receiving countries in their exportations to the United States of competitive products at prices below the cost of manufacture in America.

We weren't stopping aid to needy peoples, we were trying to stop exploration of underprivileged peoples who are forced to work for as low as 5 cents an hour, under the most heartbreaking inhuman working conditions, in order that a few families and officials can get richer by shipping their low-cost items into the American market at fabulous profits because of the great volumes consumed by the American public.

As an example, a few years ago, Japan shipped a few thousand cigarette lighters to the United States. In 1958, Japanese low-wage employers shipped 42,600,000 lighters to the United States. This represents over \$50 million in the American marketplace, and yet, the free traders in our midst say this is made up by selling Japan \$50 million

worth of cotton. What we really traded was American jobs. For every job we gained picking cotton, we lost at least 20 making lighters.

This is true in almost every phase of our economy. We sell Germany certain types of steel plate. We buy back Volkswagens. No one seems to figure how many less jobs it takes to make a half ton of steel as against an automobile ready for the road with glass, tires, seats, battery, engine, springs, ignition, lights, and the many components that make up a modern car.

By starting to close the foreign aid loophole (the Dent amendment), in our trade agreements, we at least will protect the American worker and investor against the exploiters both here and abroad from using his tax money to put him out of work.

Helping a needy neighbor is charity. It stops being charity when you buy back from your neighbor the help you gave him in the first place—it then becomes stupidity.

If it were plain stupidity we could worry a little less because sooner or later we would outgrow it. It's more than that. It's mixed up with enormous profits, exploitation of workers, international moneychanging, so-called global diplomacy and plain one-world favoritism by men of such stature, their wishes are almost law.

These are the dangers. Little peoples have protection only through elected representatives and with the combinations of power, press, politics, professors, and public figures, the congressional prestige in this field is almost nonexistent. The registered lobbyists, the representatives of foreign countries, importers, and exporters in and out of Government is the greatest group of talent ever assembled in our Capitol.

As chairman of the committee studying the effect of imports and exports upon American unemployment, I can assure you all that this Nation is in deep, serious trouble unless we put more hard, commonsense and less theoretical planning into our trade and aid "deals." Let's call them deals, because stripped of their high-sounding names, that's all they are.

My committee has heard from many areas of employment. No responsible witness has said jobs are created by our policy, except in the field of foreign aid. Any 8-year-old kid knows that if you give away \$4 billion, and you buy 80 percent of the goods from yourself to give away, you'll have to have some people to make the goods to give away. This isn't funny, we actually count the goods we give away or sell for foreign counterpart (funny) money as exports in our trade balance.

We're told that we must trade to make our country prosperous. This is only true, however, when we buy what we need and sell what we don't need.

We do it differently. We sell cotton and buy shirts; we sell logs and buy plywood; we sell hides and buy leather; and now we even go so far as to sell or give away wheat and buy macaroni and bread.

We're becoming a supplier of raw materials and a buyer of consumer products. The real victim is the American worker, looking for a job that's been exported.

Did you know that right now we are buying bread to the extent that hearings have been requested by both the bakery companies and their workers?

We have testimony from macaroni manufacturers showing that the short supply of durum wheat necessary for the making of good macaroni products has been sold to competitive nations, while the American plants either shut down or make an inferior product. In either case, it helps foreign traders.

This is also true of hides. Our tanneries are either shut down or working part time

because foreign buyers are grabbing raw hides at high prices and using their own cheap labor for processing, ship back leather and leather goods below American costs of production.

This way, the American taxpayer gets it both ways, coming and going. He loses his job because we export the raw material, and then he is forced to buy cheap foreign-made goods to stretch his reduced income which in turn takes his neighbor's job.

You can't win in a game with marked cards and dealt by professional gamblers. Foreign traders are professionals. There's one consolation, the shirt we're losing is imported, either Japanese or "Hongkonganese."

These are just the minor disturbances in the field of trade and aid, as we practice these so-called diplomatic acts.

We've covered a few products, now let's take a look at the ore picture. Slowly, but surely, our mineral-producing areas are being forced into the same governmental controls as their wheat-producing neighbors. With the coming subsidies for lead and zinc, we are stepping up the control of our Government over prices, wages, and profits. This may be good, it may be desirable, it may even be the ultimate goal of the professional planners. All we can ask is that if this is so, let's be told about it, straight from the shoulder and not be hiding behind a serious and ever-present threat of war and devastation.

Two recent events ought to shake the complacency of the everyday citizen. First, Congress (the House) passed a subsidy for iron and zinc ranging from 1½ cents to 3 cents, at present market prices, per pound. The miners (owners and workers) protested. They did not want Government subsidy. They wanted and begged for Government protection against imports. They ask for one-half-cent-a-pound increase in tariffs; they would have settled for half a loaf and accepted just part of our own market by allowing foreign producers a quota of our needs. The answer was an emphatic "no." Instead of the traders paying the one-half cent tariff, the American taxpayer will pay 3 cents. It won't help a bit; it will cost us money, but the records show that there is no bottom in the selling price of foreign low-wage produced goods and apparently no ceiling on subsidies from our Treasury. So now we have the miner joining the farmer in the stockpile business.

The second event followed within a week of House action on subsidies for lead and zinc. The State Department negotiated another of its classic deals. There is a shortage of wheat in Canada and Australia because of adverse weather conditions, so they can't supply their domestic and world (full price) markets.

We have a "lotta wheat," so we make a deal with these two countries—\$10 million worth of our subsidized wheat for \$10 million worth of lead and zinc (100,000 tons). It doesn't seem to matter that we have lead and zinc coming out of our ears, stockpiles so high we have to subsidize our mines to keep our mines working because of the surplus of lead and zinc being dumped into this country by foreign countries, including both Canada and Australia.

One of the outstanding authorities of mines and minerals is the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, from the State of Colorado. In an appearance before my committee studying the impact of imports on American jobs, he had this to say:

"You will recall, Mr. Chairman, last week on the floor of the House when a bill was being considered for assistance to small producers in the lead and zinc industry, I detailed for the House the steady decline in



employment in the lead-zinc industry. I think you will agree, after I have reviewed these details, that this job loss to American industry is a direct result of our imports policy. Put another way, we have sacrificed our American jobs on the altar of our international trade policies.

"In 1952 there were 42,705 persons employed in the lead-zinc industry. The United States produced 390,162 tons of lead and 666,000 tons of zinc, for a total of 1,065,162 tons of lead and zinc; and consumed in the United States 1,130,795 tons of lead and 852,783 tons of slab zinc, or a total of 1,983,578 tons of lead and slab zinc. By 1956 domestic employment had been reduced to 33,706 Americans in a year when our domestic mine production had fallen off to 895,166 tons of lead and zinc, but our consumption rose to 2,218,507 tons of lead and slab zinc. It is important to note that the greatest decrease in employment (8,645) was in the mines and mills.

"By 1960, 20,000 jobs had been lost since 1952 in the lead-zinc industry overall with the mines and mills suffering the most. General imports of lead in 1960 amounted to 359,917 tons, or approximately 145 percent of the U.S. mine production of 246,669 tons; and general imports of zinc at 571,000 tons were 131 percent of the U.S. mine production of 435,427 tons.

"Although, as I have demonstrated, the lead-zinc industry has suffered a loss of employment in the United States because of import policies and practices, the Department of Defense, in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has dismissed the industry as not needing assistance because there are now only 'a small number of miners' involved.

"Finally, I point out, although I am sure I do not have to remind you, that the effects are felt beyond each immediate industry, as for example, shutdowns of mines affects supply houses which also employ people; unemployment of miners affects those who sell consumer goods in mining areas; and the importation of the metals of foreign origin produced under adverse labor conditions acts as an excuse by which American employers seek to deprive American labor of benefits in this country in order to seek a competition position on the market."

That's not all. We give the wheat at subsidized prices, and at the same time we arrange to sell it through American grain brokers to world markets. Why? Simply because this will give the two foreign countries American gold credits and we will probably pick up foreign counterpart (foreign money). It may not be so, but it wouldn't surprise anyone.

Why couldn't we sell the wheat to the nations that needed it? Why do we buy lead and zinc to add to our already overloaded warehouses and stockpiles?

If you can get an answer to these questions (honestly), you can get the blue ribbon and go to the head of the class.

A few years ago, under our foreign-aid program, we aided Korea by setting up a glass manufacturing plant. Recently, our committee heard of the results of this great help to our friends. The glass is being sold in Clarksburg, W. Va., while the Pittsburgh Plate in Clarksburg is laying off workers, and begging for tariff increases in Washington.

Apropos of this situation, the Tariff Commission, after years and years of pleading from the glass industry recommended that the tariff rates be increased. Not just a token increase, but rather a full retreat. After all the arguments over these many years, it recommended a tariff rate set up under the old Smoot-Hawley tariff law of over 30 years ago.

What happened? The normal thing in our world trade actions: Belgium, a large exporter

to the United States, protested loud, long and effectively. They said they may be forced to retaliation; they said that their sound economy was based upon controlling a certain share of the American domestic market for glass. The State Department jumped into the deal and you can guess whose side they took. They said we couldn't afford to raise tariffs on glass, we couldn't afford to offend Belgium right now because of the Berlin crisis.

The result: The President refused to accept the increased tariff recommendation by sending it back for further study.

Meanwhile, glass keeps coming in, workers get laid off their jobs, taxes increase and foreign aid builds more glass plants in Korea, Formosa and other needy nations.

This is just one example of building plants abroad with taxpayer's money and then taking the taxpayer's income away from him by importing the products from the plant his money built.

Someone said lately there are three ways now, instead of two ways, to get rich. They advise: Marry a rich woman, inherit a fortune or get the Government to build a factory for you overseas.

Recently, when we had a few days' strike at the docks, we were threatened with a gasoline ration because of the shortage of imported oil. For years, we've been importing so much oil that our exploration and production of American supplies has been drastically reduced.

Let's see what our own oil producers have to say about this situation:

"In Austin, Tex., members of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association (TIPO) are set to meet tomorrow on the 'muddled' oil imports situation. TIPO's president, J. F. West, in announcing the meeting hit the administration's current crude oil policy.

"He said: 'The recent maritime strike and the Kuwait crisis have once again forcibly demonstrated that a country that allows itself, through neglect or through planned policy, to become dependent on water-moved sources for vital raw materials has weakened its national defense posture.'

"\* \* \* He also commented that 'at the same time, we realize the necessity of subjecting to the closest scrutiny any export proposal which might result in large volumes of crude oil or natural gas liquids entering U.S. markets at the expense of U.S. domestic production.'

"In the IPAA letter to Secretary Udall the association also called on the Interior Department to reverse the OIAB action which raised the crude oil import quota for Texaco, Inc., on the west coast."

In case of war, where will we get the ores, coal, oil, raincoats, watches, binoculars, typewriters, lighters, chairs, dishes, and on and on and on. This Nation is becoming a dependent nation upon others for its way of life.

We ask Congress to pass trade and aid bills in the name of making foreign countries independent and at the same time, we are making ourselves a second-rate producer of the necessities of life in this country. We are ourselves becoming dependent upon others not alone for our well-being, but perhaps for our survival.

We admit we cannot live alone in this complicated and troubled world. We must also admit that we can't live dependent upon others in this world complicated, troubled or otherwise.

As a fledgling nation, we had our troubles, our crisis, our one worlders, two worlders and no worlders. What did we do? We rebelled against being a colony providing raw materials and being used as a market by the mother country for the goods produced, from these raw materials.

We valued our markets, our industries, our labor, our farms, our institutions, and above all, our economic independence.

We protected ourselves against the destruction of our production facilities and jobs by every means available including tariffs, treaties, quotas, embargoes, and statesmanship. Not the least of which was statesmanship.

One thing you can be sure of: If we had taken the same stand then as we have in recent years, there wouldn't have been any country or industry or jobs or farms to argue about.

Compare, if you will, the situation we have today with that of yesteryear. In growing years we protected American industry from foreign industry. Today we are busy protecting American industry from American industry.

Here's a classic example:

"An almost incredible drama—even in the present stage of development of our welfare state—is going on in bureaucratic Washington.

"One of the Nation's railways—by typical American ingenuity—has discovered a profitable way to effect a drastic reduction in selected freight rates \* \* \* but the U.S. Government, at least temporarily won't give it permission to do so.

"Southern Railway has developed a super-duty 100-ton aluminum freight car \* \* \* suitable for hauling grain efficiently and economically.

"Using this new equipment in multitariff shipments, Southern can effect sizable economies in basic transportation costs, loading operations, terminal and transit switching, routing, paperwork, etc.

"As a result, the old rate of \$10.50 per net ton for grain movement from St. Louis to Gainesville, Ga., for example, can now be lowered to \$3.97, \$4.07, or \$4.17, depending on volume; and the railroad will still show a greater ton-mile profit than its present average on general freight movement.

"When the new rate was filed with the ICC, a lusty clamor arose from unregulated carriers adversely affected by such 'unfair competition.'

"Loud in support of their protests was the TVA which has spent \$200 million in making the Tennessee River navigable for barges carrying grain and other products.

"This taxpayer-endowed project has been of material assistance in putting the railroads out of the grain-carrying business.

"Now, when the railroads—with their own funds—attempt to fight back, TVA officials complain that any such cut in rates would 'disrupt efforts to create a Tennessee River common-carrier industry.'

"The new rates, which were to go into effect in August of this year, were filed by Southern with the ICC, but the Commission ordered that the reduction be suspended until March 1962, pending an investigation, on the grounds that the rates may be found to be 'unjust and unreasonable,' constituting 'unfair and destructive competitive practices.'

"Free enterprise made the United States the greatest, most powerful, most fruitful nation on earth."

This is labeled "unfair competition" because it is between American competitors while at the same time our markets are being flooded with every type of product and produce from every foreign shore at prices that don't even meet our cost of production. In fact, sometimes it doesn't even meet the cost of the raw materials and certainly never meets our labor costs.

When are we going to realize that trade is a profit-seeking venture? No person outside of dreamers and persons in Government-protected jobs without responsibility for creating jobs or production believes trade, internal or external, to be other than a greedy, mercenary, profiteering enterprise.